ĺ	M4E5dupS	
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	
3	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	
4	V •	19 Cr. 444 (RMB) Remote Proceeding
5	JOHN PIERRE DUPONT,	Remote Froceding
6	Defendant.	
7	x	
8		New York, N.Y. April 14, 2022
9	_	9:25 a.m.
10	Before:	
11	HON. RICHARD M. BE	
12		U.S. District Judge
13	APPEARANCES	
14 15	DAMIAN WILLIAMS	
16	United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York BY: ALEXANDER ROSSMILLER	
17	Assistant United States Attorney	
18	FEDERAL DEFENDERS OF NEW YORK Attorneys for Defendant	
19	BY: ZAWADI BAHARANYI	
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. ...

(Case called; The Court and all parties appearing via video conferencing)

THE COURT: Good morning, everybody.

I guess we will start over, so to speak. We had begun last time and there was supplemental information that I wanted to review and so I think I am up to speed now. Let's just confirm, the defense submission dated 11/24/21 requested a virtual or remote hearing and we are proceeding by video conference today, and that has to do with Mr. DuPont's medical issues. He is in a nursing home and is that still the position of the defense, that we should waive opportunity to have sentence in Court?

MS. BAHARANYI: That is correct. Given the pandemic and increase in COVID numbers and his physical status, we ask to proceed remotely today.

THE COURT: Mr. DuPont is agreeable to waiving his right to be in court?

MS. BAHARANYI: Yes, your Honor.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I am.

THE COURT: Mr. Rossmiller, is that OK with you?

MR. ROSSMILLER: Yes, your Honor. No objection from the government. Thank you.

THE COURT: And it is true that there are still some restrictions in entering and exiting the court house, although we could and we have been doing actual submissions, we have

also been doing some virtual proceedings still.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

During the last proceeding, which was March 22, 2022, it was brought to my attention that there was a new submission from the defense dated March 17, 2022 which I had not seen. have had the opportunity to review that submission and feel comfortable going forward today. In sentencing, as I think everybody knows, the United States Sentencing Guidelines are not and have not been mandatory for -- since the mid-2000s, 2005, 2006, and 2007, and instead of mandatory guidelines we fashion a sentence by reviewing the factors at 18, United States Code, Section 3553(a), which I have done several times in this proceeding, and these factors include the nature and the circumstances of the offense or crime, the history and characteristics of in this case Mr. DuPont, and the need for the sentence imposed to reflect the seriousness of the offense, to promote respect for the law, to provide a just punishment, to afford adequate deterrence to criminal conduct, to protect the public from further crimes of the defendant, and to provide the defendant with needed educational or vocational training and, in particular in this case, medical care or other correctional treatment in the most effective manner. In doing all of that we look at the kinds of sentences that are available, the kinds of sentence and the sentencing range established under the guidelines even though, as I say, they are no longer mandatory. We look at any policy statements that

may have been issued by the sentencing commission that apply. We seek to avoid unwarranted sentence disparities among similarly situated defendants and, in appropriate cases, to provide for restitution.

We always start with a guidelines analysis, again even though the guidelines are not mandatory, and here the offense level is 23, in my opinion, the guideline range is 51 to 63 months of incarceration, plus two additional years, that is to say 24 months consecutive, and therefore the guideline range is actually 75 to 87 months of incarceration and the Criminal History Category is II.

The second count, the aggravated identity theft carries a two-year consecutive term of incarceration. On July 29, 2021, Mr. DuPont pled guilty before me to Counts One and Two of the indictment, that is to say, wire fraud and aggravated identity theft. He pled guilty pursuant to a written plea agreement which was dated June 17, 2021 in which there is a stipulated -- meaning agreed to -- guideline range of 75 to 87 months of incarceration; that's the range, a range of 51 to 63 months on Count One, followed by 24 months consecutive on Count Two.

On July 29, 2021, I signed, after the parties had a consent preliminary order of forfeiture money judgment as to Mr. DuPont in which the parties agreed to the forfeiture and money judgment in the amount of \$245,000 in U.S. currency, and

that represented the amount of proceeds traceable to the offense charged in Count One of the indictment that defendant had personally obtained.

Mr. DuPont is 83 years old, he is single at this time, and has two adult children and four grandchildren. He maintains a relationship with his son and his son's children and his former wife. He appears to be estranged from his daughter and her family. He has some contact with -- social contact with women with whom he had been romantically involved in the past.

Defense counsel advised the Court that he attended St. Anthony's High School in Long Beach, California, and graduated in 1956. He received a bachelors degree in math from Long Beach State College, now called California State University. He got that degree in 1959. He received a masters degree in education from the University of Southern California. He also received an Associate Degree of arts in social and behavioral sciences from San Diego Community College and a bachelors degree in history from the University of California Riverside.

According to the presentence investigation report,

Mr. DuPont grew up in an in tact family and reported to

Probation that he had a great, loving childhood and had in fact
been spoiled. That is at paragraph 91 of the presentence
report.

He was arrested on March 18, 2019 and has been detained at either the MDC or the MCC or the hospital, or the Windsor Park Nursing Home where he currently resides. This is all since his arrest.

According to the presentence report, he has prior disciplinary sanctions from a prior term of imprisonment that included being in an unauthorized area, stealing an institution truck, and leaving the camp and refusing to take a drug test.

The nature of Mr. DuPont's offense is described, as follows, principally in the presentence report:

Mr. DuPont defrauded thousands of donors who incorrectly believed they were donating to legitimate Political Action Committees — otherwise known as PACs — to the campaigns of candidates in various federal and state elections and to certain political causes. Mr. DuPont took more than \$250,000 and/or used the money for his own purposes. The defendant never reported any of the donations he received in filings required by the Federal Election Commission and the donations were not directed to the campaigns or causes purportedly being supported by the PACs in question and related websites created by Mr. DuPont.

The plea agreement contains a two-level adjustment for obstruction of justice and the presentence report describes that conduct, as follows:

Mr. DuPont willfully obstructed or impeded the

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. . . .

administration of justice when he, after being arrested for the offense, jumped bail and led the government open a months' -- that's plural -- months' long multi-state chase which included Mr. DuPont renting a U-Haul and claiming to drop it off in Washington state only to dump it on the side of the road in Texas weeks later. That summary comes from the presentence report at paragraph 63.

Mr. DuPont has a prior criminal history that includes the following convictions: Mail fraud, bank fraud, money laundering, false impersonation, fraud claims, unauthorized use of a vehicle, grand theft of firearm, etc. According to the defense, the defendant left a prison in Oregon where he was being harassed and threatened after it was disclosed that he was a cooperator. Mr. DuPont apparently shared a cell with an individual charged with killing his brother and sister-in-law and Mr. DuPont agreed to share information that he had learned about his cell mate with federal prosecutors and testified at trial.

The defendant suffers from a number of medical conditions. The presentence report states that as provided by defense counsel, the defendant was diagnosed with unspecified dementia with behavioral disturbance, seborrheic dermatitis, also urinary tract infection, nausea, dry eye syndrome, insomnia, gout, Gastroesophageal Reflux Disease, atopic dermatitis, migraines, vitamin B-12 deficiency, anemia, type II

Diabetes, and stage III chronic renal disease. These diagnoses appear to have been clarified by a copy of the physician order report at Windsor Park Nursing Home provided by counsel.

Additionally, counsel provided a list of over 10 medications prescribed for Mr. DuPont.

The presentence investigation report relayed additional information about Mr. DuPont's health, as follows. This is a quote: According to a copy of Mr. DuPont's medical declaration dated April 13, 2021 provided by defense counsel from Ms. Emily Kirshner MDMA of the Penn Medicine Lancaster General Health located in Pennsylvania, in November 2019 Mr. DuPont was admitted to New York Presbyterian Hospital after he fell and hit his head on a toilet while incarcerated. After 10 days it was determined that Mr. DuPont could not return to prison due to his weakness and debility.

From November 20, 2019 to March 12, 2020, Mr. DuPont was admitted to Kingsbrook Jewish Medical Center after complaints of unsteady gait, motor weakness, and excessive migraines. He was then transferred to Windsor Park Nursing Home.

Ms. Kirshner reported that Mr. DuPont is frail and deconditioned due to a number of medical conditions. Because of his frailty, Mr. DuPont lost over 30 pounds in under a year. Ms. Kirshner noted he has moderate dementia, chronic pain, neuropathy, type II mellitus, may need gallbladder procedures

and other medical issues. It was further reported that because of Mr. DuPont's overall decline in medical health, the defendant is unable to function independently. She indicated that he is at high risk of worsening and will continue to decline.

In addition to his medical declaration, the defense counsel provided a copy of Mr. DuPont's life expectancy which was assessed by Scott J. Kush, MD JDMPH of the Life Expectancy Group located in Menlo Park, California. Based on the defendant's medical history, Dr. Kush reported that Dupont has a life expectancy to be approximately four additional years as of the date of the report which was July 13, 2020.

Mr. DuPont has a prior employment history that includes owning a tax business and buying and selling mobile home parks. He has been retired since 2002 and receives social security benefits and disability benefits. He reported to probation that he is a master chess player.

By submissions dated November 24, 2021 and December 16, 2021, the defense requests a sentence of time-served. These submissions were further supplemented by submissions dated January 7, 2022 and March 17, 2022, and the defense argues that a sentence of time-served is warranted due, among other things, to Mr. DuPont's age, ill health, and conditions of confinement including conditions during the pandemic.

In the March 12, 2022 submission, defense counsel

provides a lengthy chronology — chronological history of Mr. DuPont's incarceration of health and the summary starts on October 27, 2019, which is the date of arrest of Mr. DuPont who was arrested in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, and it goes through January 20 — I'm skipping the intermediary time periods and what happened during those times — it goes through January 20, 2022 when Mr. DuPont was taken to New York—Presbyterian hospital after complaining of chest pains. He was treated with nitroglycerin at that point in time. He requested to be discharged because he wanted to be treated at Long Island Jewish Medical Center and he was returned to Windsor Park Nursing Home where he remains at this time in the custody of the U.S. Marshals.

According to defense counsel, Windsor Park Nursing

Home is both a nursing home and a jail for the defendant. He

is shackled by his legs at all times, the shackles are attached

to his bed. There are two guards who monitor him at all times.

He is escorted in any common area inside the nursing home and

is not permitted to go to the courtyard or the garden area.

Defense counsel acknowledges that defendant has not been at the MCC or MDC -- these are jail facilities located in Manhattan and Brooklyn, respectively -- since November 2019, so that means from the time of his arrest in October 27 of 2019, starting in November 2019, if I understand this correctly, he has not been in MDC or MCC but defense also notes that he has

not been at liberty for the last 28 months now, approximately 29 months.

In a prior submission, defense counsel noted that Mr. DuPont has several serious physical ailments including Stage III chronic kidney disease, Type II diabetes, debilitating migraines, arthritis, gallstones, kidney stones, and gout. Defense counsel also advised the Court that coronary artery bypass surgery was recommended, however Mr. DuPont and his son declined surgery due to his age and risk of complications.

Defense counsel describes his childhood as idyllic.

Defense counsel notes that the defendant's adult years have been wrought with instability brought by defendant's own reckless decision making. According to the defense, at one point in his life the defendant earned millions of dollars and had a reputation as a top financier in California, however

Mr. DuPont's company defrauded investors, filed bankruptcy, and Dupont was convicted and imprisoned. Defense states that after that, his wife divorced him and he had a strained relationship with his children. He also found it difficult to obtain and/or maintain legitimate employment and he continued committing crimes and serving terms in prison. According to defense counsel, the defendant never recovered from losing everything and causing his family to lose everything. That can further be examined at the defense submission at page 7, the submission

dated March 17, 2022.

With regard to the instant offenses, defense counsel states that some of the money went towards fundraising calls and flyers for legitimate candidates but defense acknowledges that much of it did not. According to the government's December 4, 2021 submission, the government found no evidence that any of the money went to legitimate purposes.

Defense counsel describes the offense as far less egregious than many wire fraud and aggravated identity theft schemes in that this is not a case where victims were defrauded out of their life savings or retirement. Defense counsel argues that the average donation amount was \$100 and most from one-time donors. I guess the import of that, those remarks from the defense, is that it is not no harm no foul, but if the defrauded amount is less than \$100 and it is from a one-time donor, I guess the implication -- well, we will hear from defense but it seems to suggest that there is some minimization here of the fraud.

Defense counsel, in my opinion, fails to note that it is just how massive. How massive the scheme was is not brought up by the defense. It spanned several years, it utilized approximately 15 different websites — this is the scheme of Mr. DuPont — it received more than 1,000 donations and the donations totaled \$250,000. I have to say that, personally, I regard that as egregious and serious.

Defense counsel notes that while the defendant was incarcerated for this offense, his son has resumed a relationship with him and has agreed to be an integral part of defendant's re-entry plan. According to the defense, the defendant's son is prepared to welcome his father into his home upon his release and to help him transition to a nursing home or senior living facility near him. There is a letter enclosed as Exhibit A from Mr. DuPont's son, John Rinaldo, to this effect.

By submission dated December 16, 2021, the defense states that an updated life expectancy report was prepared for Mr. DuPont that estimates that he is expected to live an additional 2.6 years with a median survival time of two additional years. This updated report was prepared by the same Dr. Kush, and is dated December 9, 2021, and the defense argues that a guideline sentence in this case would result in the likely death in prison of Mr. DuPont and defense counsel argues that Mr. DuPont's life is drastically different now than it was at the time of the offense and far different from his life of 30 to 40 years ago when he incurred his prior convictions.

I note that in his January 7, 2022 letter, he confirms that if the defendant were sentenced to time-served, the defendant's son John Rinaldo would fly to New York City in order to transport the defendant to his home in California and Mr. Rinaldo would seek to a find long-term care facility for

his father. And in the March 17th submission from the defense, defense counsel points out that defendant's son is 51 years old, Mr. Rinaldo is a registered nurse and an administrator at a Kaiser Permanente Urgent Care Facility in Ventura, California. Mr. Rinaldo has also been employed as a medical counsel. Mr. Rinaldo also apparently received a law degree from Western State University College of Law in 2014. Mr. Rinaldo advised defense counsel that his father could live with him until he has secured a placement in a facility for his father. According to Mr. Rinaldo, the defendant would have to enroll in Medi-Cal, and once his insurance is in order, facilities would be able to make a determination about a bed availability for Mr. DuPont. That's found in the defense submission dated March 17, 2022 on page 6.

By submission dated December 4, 2021, the government requests a sentence that is within the stipulated guideline range of 75 to 87 months. The government contends that defendant's underlying conduct in this case was calculated, sophisticated, and predatory, and that his conduct following his arrest, which we haven't gotten to yet, was significantly obstructive. Over the course of years — this is going back to the first count — from approximately 2015 up until his arrest in 2019, Mr. DuPont defrauded more than 2,000 victims of nearly a quarter of a million dollars. In short, the defendant set up fraudulent Political Action Committees and falsely impersonated

campaigns and candidates to initially solicit and then to steal donations to these caused and campaigns.

Now we come to the obstruction which every time I read about it I am fairly astonished but I think I have it pretty clear in my head what happened. So, this is regarding the two-level obstruction of justice enhancement which requires a two-year consecutive sentence.

The government describes what happened as follows:

After being charged in this case, the defendant was arrested in California on March 18, 2019. He was presented on March 19, 2019, and following the presentment, the defendant was released on conditions of bail and was ordered to appear in the Southern District of New York on March 25, 2019 at 10:00 a.m.

Mr. DuPont signed an acknowledgment of defendant -that's a form -- in which he agreed to the terms of his bail at
the time he was released including that he was aware of the
conditions of release, and promising to obey all conditions of
release and to appear as directed. Rather than appearing -this is from the government's submission. Rather than
appearing as required in the Southern District of New York,
Mr. DuPont fled, leading law enforcement officers on a months'
long chase and employing sophisticated means to avoid capture.

On March 23, 2019, just days after the defendant was released on bail, he apparently rented a U-Haul truck at a location in Arizona which was nearly 90 miles away from his

home. He rented the "moving van truck" with capacity to tow his Mercedes Benz sedan which had been purchased with the proceeds of his fraud, and he entered into a contract with U-Haul for a one-way trip to Tukwila, Washington to arrive there on March 28, 2019, three days after he was scheduled to appear in the Southern District of New York. Tuckwila is approximately 1,300 miles from the defendant's home and is a short drive to the Canadian border. This stated destination, however, was a ruse -- this is from the government's submission -- presumably designed to mislead law enforcement. In fact, the defendant drove to Texas, not to the state of Washington, where the U-Haul truck was found abandoned in late March, 2019.

In the months' following the defendant's flight, he was identified following the use of credit and debit cards, surveillance video, license plate readers and other methods as having traveled at least in California, Arizona, New Mexico, Texas, and Oklahoma, and on October 27, 2019, after more than seven months of eluding law enforcement, the defendant was driving a Honda CRV in Oklahoma and was pulled over for failing to stop at a stop sign. In that traffic stop the defendant claimed falsely that his name was John Reynolds. Subsequently, in response to being asked his name during booking, the defendant stated, again falsely, that his name was Michael Reynolds.

So, one thing I am curious, and would like to hear from the defense, if you could, and that is in this -- first of all, if this scenario that I have described of, with the U-Haul and presumably going to Washington after the date that he is due in New York and winding up in Oklahoma, if any of that, you know, wild goose chase I think is a fair way to describe the situation, if any of that or most of it or all of it is reconcilable with this enormous list of his medical disabilities, or did all of those medical disabilities first appear upon his ultimate arrest for the traffic violation seems -- I'm not suggesting he doesn't have those medical conditions, but it seems from this, again, wild goose chase, to be a person of, it would appear, great physical stamina and --

but, anyway, so that is something, maybe I'm misinterpreting what happened. I would like to hear defense counsel's point of view.

MS. BAHARANYI: Your Honor, would you like me to respond later?

THE COURT: Yes, sure.

The government acknowledges -- and I do too, by the way -- that Mr. DuPont's age and health circumstances are definitely meaningful, indeed are mitigating factors going toward a sentence, but the government also argues that they are nevertheless far outweighed by the aggravating considerations of both the offense here and the defendant's very significant

criminal history. That's a quote from the government's submission.

And the government also argues that even at an advanced age Mr. DuPont has — this is a quote too — not learned his lesson from four prior years—long prison sentence and he remained fully, able, and willing to defraud thousands of victims even as an 80-year—old man. The defendant's crime here did not require youth, strength, agility, or other physical ability. It strikes me that his — the escapade with the U—Haul did require some of those characteristics. All he needed was a computer and access to the Internet. And even after committing the fraudulent scheme and identity theft, the defendant committed the additional crime, I would suggest, physically tasking crime, of jumping bail.

You will recall at my request during the conference on January 10, 2020, the government submitted additional information and in the letter dated January 28, 2022, as to the bail jumping offense committed by Mr. DuPont, the government states that Mr. DuPont was charged with, by complaint in this District, with committing wire fraud and aggravated identity theft on March — this is when he was charged — on March 13, 2019, and was arrested in or around his home in California on March 18, 2019. He was presented on the complaint the following day, March 19, 2019, in the neighboring District of Arizona where he was released subject to certain conditions set

by the magistrate judge. The relevant order required the defendant to next appear in the United States Court House at 500 Pearl Street -- in which I am currently located -- New York, New York, on March 25, 2019 at 10:00 a.m. or as directed by counsel. And it also set forth that defendant was being released on unsecured bond in the amount of \$100,000. That's found in the government's letter dated January 28, 2022.

And then I won't rehash it, the government -- if I bring it up and when the government speaks there is a further description, once again, of this bail jumping thing episode -- escapade -- wild goose chase, whatever you would like to call it:

So, I have also reviewed the presentence investigation report in this case, it was prepared on September 21, 2021, together with an addendum dated October 14, 2021, and the sentencing recommendation approved on October 14, 2021, and I do have the correspondence from the defense dated November -- no, dated -- yes -- dated November 24, 2021; December 16, 2021; January 7, 2022; and March 17, 2022; and correspondingly dated from the government December 4, 2021 and January 28, 2022, from Mr. Rossmiller.

So I would ask at this time defense counsel and defendant whether they had the opportunity to read and discuss the presentence investigation report, the addendum, and sentencing recommendation.

1 MS. BAHARANYI: Yes, your Honor. 2 THE COURT: Mr. DuPont, you went over that presentence 3 investigation report -- do we have Mr. DuPont? 4 MS. BAHARANYI: Can you see him, your Honor? He is 5 seated next to me. 6 THE COURT: I cannot. 7 MS. BAHARANYI: Oh. 8 THE COURT: I can see his left shoulder but -- yes. 9 There he is. 10 Mr. DuPont, have you been over that presentence 11 investigation report with your counsel? 12 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. My counsel reviewed it with me. THE COURT: OK. Did you in fact read it? 13 14 THE DEFENDANT: No. 15 THE COURT: You did or did not? It would be unusual, 16 perhaps, if you did not read it. 17 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. I went over it and read it. 18 THE COURT: OK. And do either of you, starting with defense counsel, have any objections to the content of that 19 20 report? MS. BAHARANYI: Your Honor, none beyond what we have 21 22 already provided to probation. 23 THE COURT: And how about any objections from 24 Mr. DuPont? 25 THE DEFENDANT: No. No.

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. . . .

• • • •

THE COURT: Hearing no additional objections, I intend to return that report to the probation department, that is our practice, and I am happy at this time to hear from defense counsel and from Mr. DuPont and from the government. And if you have the opportunity or the occasion, if you could respond to at least that one question that I raised about the obstruction and whether that implicated, in any way, any physical disabilities that Mr. DuPont has.

MS. BAHARANYI: Yes, your Honor. I am moving the computer close to ensure that the Court can hear me.

Mr. DuPont remains seated beside me.

THE COURT: It is helpful to see Mr. DuPont in the proceeding.

MS. BAHARANYI: Sure. As long as you are able to hear me. I didn't want to --

THE COURT: Yes.

MS. BAHARANYI: Right now I am away from the laptop.

THE COURT: I can hear you but I still can't see
Mr. DuPont.

MS. BAHARANYI: Your Honor, to start with the question that you posed, essentially what happened between October 27, 2019 and what Mr. DuPont now, over the past two years, what Mr. DuPont experienced between his arrest and his incarceration, the early days of his incarceration at the MCC of New York was a fall that led to a series of other serious

health events. The fall in November 2019 your Honor, is one in which he was taken to the hospital for a concussion and following that experienced weakness, frailty, and was submitted to Kingsbrook Hospital for a number of months. But that's not the only serious physical event that he experienced after his arrest.

I think what the Court has seen in our submissions and what I want to highlight are the cardiac issues that have now arisen since October 2021. That is not something that he was experiencing prior to his arrest in March, April, May 2019. He did not have cardiac arrest, he did not have a failing heart.

Now, perhaps there were underlying issues there but he had never been hospitalized from his heart failing until October 2021. At that time, your Honor, they performed — they kept him in the hospital for three weeks first. They performed surgery or attempted to perform surgery to stent his blocked arteries. One of those blocked arteries is nicknamed the widow maker. The widow maker, essentially, is a particular artery that is notorious for causing death for whom it is blocked. They were able to stent one of his arteries as reflected in our paperwork. They were not able to stent the widow maker.

So he is still in this position, your Honor, where every day is essentially a precarious day for him. His heart is far weaker than it ever was. He was supposed to have been taken for a follow-up appointment with the cardiovascular team

at Long Island Jewish Medical Center but either because of issues with the nursing home or marshal transport, that has not happened yet.

THE COURT: Is it true or is it -- am I misunderstanding that Mr. DuPont has rejected, and his son, further heart surgery?

MS. BAHARANYI: So not that they rejected it. They were proposing a particular type of surgery in October 2021, open heart surgery. That is one type of procedure to address blockage but it is the riskiest type of procedure for someone his age. There are far less evasive procedures to go into the heart that unfortunately Long Island Jewish Medical Center could not do for him so he — and truly his son who is also on the line, your Honor, and I will note has been on the line for each of our hearings —

THE COURT: Oh, I didn't realize. He is certainly welcome to be here.

MS. BAHARANYI: Yes. He has been listening in. He was here in March and also in January, but he and his son made the decision that they wanted to be able to get this procedure done in a more minimally invasive way that is less risky to Mr. DuPont, his father, when he is home, if permitted. I think there is an interim procedure that is stenting that he is still waiting to take place.

Stenting, right?

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. ...

THE DEFENDANT: When it was blocked.

MS. BAHARANYI: Yes, that's what I was explaining, he is explaining that the right was stented but the left descending artery was not, that's the widow maker so that's what he is still awaiting a follow-up procedure on here in New York City so there are two sort of separate procedures that can take place; the interim one, which is what he wants to stent, and a slightly more invasive but not as dangerous procedure going into his heart to actually fix the issue that he is dealing with.

THE COURT: Is there not a procedure where someone could have heart surgery while maybe incarcerated that's less invasive than open heart surgery?

MS. BAHARANYI: It was not made available as an option from the Long Island Jewish Medical Center which is where they took Mr. DuPont in October so I don't know if it's going to be made available to him at a different, better medical center under the BOP. It is a procedure that is, actually, that is available to him in the community which is one of the reasons why we wanted to be able to return him to his home, to his son, so his son can arrange that at a proper medical treatment facility.

THE COURT: So my knowledge, so New York, for example, is one of the heart surgery — the places, the ultimate heart surgery places in the country if not the world.

25

If we could have Mr. DuPont in the picture? It is 1 really impossible not to be able to see him. 2 3 Did he and his son consult with Long Island Jewish or 4 Windsor Park or anybody about having a surgery less invasive 5 while he's in fact incarcerated? 6 MS. BAHARANYI: They had the stent placed which is an 7 interim procedure, but my understanding is that Long Island Jewish Medical Center, which is the facility he was given 8 9 access to while in custody, was not only able to do open heart 10 surgery to fix the issue -- hold on one moment? 11 (Defendant and counsel conferring) 12 THE COURT: If you are talking to me, I can't hear 13 you. 14 MS. BAHARANYI: One moment, your Honor? 15 (Defendant and counsel conferring) THE DEPUTY CLERK: Judge, I believe counsel is 16 17 conferring with her client. 18 THE COURT: Yes, but it is on mute -- intentionally. 19 I see. I see. 20 MS. BAHARANYI: I had muted myself to have a private 21 conversation. 22 THE COURT: I appreciate that and I understand that. 23 Yes. 24 MS. BAHARANYI: If I may have one moment, your Honor?

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. . . . .

• • • •

THE COURT: OK.

(Defendant and counsel conferring)

MS. BAHARANYI: Your Honor, thank you for the moment.

Mr. DuPont was explaining that the procedure he underwent at Long Island Jewish Medical Center of the stenting was the less invasive procedure option, it is just, unfortunately, it is not a permanent solution either.

(Defendant and counsel conferring)

MS. BAHARANYI: So a little bit technical, his right descending artery is still stented, his left descending artery -- which is the widow maker -- they could not complete the stent on the left descending artery so he is still in a position where he still has this blockage which could be dangerous for him.

THE DEFENDANT: Excuse me, your Honor. I -- they wanted to do open heart surgery but I consulted with my son and he consulted with the people who work with him and they said it was too dangerous to open me up because if they cracked my chest, I would probably just die from that. They recommended a less intrusive which is to put a stent in. They put a stent -- so they scheduled me for that stent operation, they put a stent in my right artery and that was successful and that can last probably, I don't know, they didn't tell me but they didn't say that it would -- that it was an alternative to open heart. They then went into my left artery but it was so blocked that they -- and I was so weak that they decided that they would

was -- in several weeks when I was stronger. That procedure was done with a scope, they didn't have to crack open my chest, they did it with a scope, but when they pulled the scope out I started to hemorrhage and at that time I flatlined. So they said they were able to bring me back and then said we will schedule again when that is stronger. I thought it would be done sooner but, unfortunately, it still hasn't been done.

I would like to make one other comment. I know what you have read in regards to the flight, OK, seems very mysterious, she doesn't want me to tell you but number one --

MS. BAHARANYI: Let me have one moment, your Honor, before we go there, if you don't mind.

THE COURT: I don't mind at all.

She wants to consult with you.

(Defendant and counsel conferring)

MS. BAHARANYI: Your Honor, he does want to provide a bit more context between the actions between March and October 2019 with the recognition that we do also want to refocus on his health. So we will get back to that, but he has asked to address the Court on that issue.

THE COURT: Sure.

THE DEFENDANT: Thank you, your Honor. I want to explain what happened after I was placed on the bail in Arizona.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I returned to my home which was 90 miles away. I returned to my home which is a trailer which I rented for \$700 a month in the desert of California. I returned to my home and purchased a round trip ticket from Las Vegas, Nevada, to New York, so that I could pursue my defense in this case.

I got in my car and attempted to drive there and passed out. When I woke up, I realized I had missed my plane so I decided I would pack up and come to New York. I rented the van in the city that I lived in Arizona which was in Blythe, California, where I lived. I then had friends assist me, I told them exactly what I was doing, I was going to come to New York, and I drove on a direct route. And if you will look at it, you will see you drive through Arizona, you drive through New Mexico, you drive through Texas, and you wind up in Oklahoma. I was on my way, I had another blackout. A lady rescued me, took me in her home, and that's when I realized that I wasn't going to make it and so I just decided that I just would try to stay there. But I wasn't jumping-jumping-jumping. I don't know where the Washington came from, I was never in Washington, I was never in Oregon, I never drove to Washington. That never happened. drove directly from my home in Arizona, I was on a direct route, and all of those states that are mentioned which are New Mexico and Arizona, are all direct from my home in Blythe, California, to New York. That was what I was trying to do. Ι

M4E5dupS realize that I failed to do it, I made a bad choice. I was 1 2 very weak and I didn't know what I was doing and, consequently, 3 I stopped in Oklahoma. But I wasn't jumping around, I was 4 never in Washington, and I was never in the states that would 5 take me there and there is no -- I was in a direct route. 6 THE COURT: What did you do in Oklahoma? 7 THE DEFENDANT: What did I do in Oklahoma? 8 THE COURT: Yeah. 9 THE DEFENDANT: I parked the van, she had some people 10 unload it, and I went to bed. 11 THE COURT: You what? 12 MS. BAHARANYI: He said he went to bed, your Honor. 13 THE COURT: Went to bed.

How long did you stay in Oklahoma?

THE DEFENDANT: I stayed for several months.

MS. BAHARANYI: So what he has explained, your Honor, is he knows he should have returned to court.

THE DEFENDANT: I did know it but then I had so many failures, I gave up.

MS. BAHARANYI: So --

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE DEFENDANT: I thought I was just going to die there.

MS. BAHARANYI: And, your Honor, I have actually had the benefit of getting a little bit more information from his son as well who has been listening in to the proceeding.

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. . . .

So the name of -- and this is, again, I'm not a medical doctor. Fortunately, his son is in the medical field. What had been proposed to Mr. DuPont was a form of bypass surgery and that's what Mr. DuPont has explained to you as well, but this -- the type of recovery or the type of procedure they have been able to do that is not as invasive is called an endoscopic coronary artery bypass. It doesn't require as much of a physical entry into the chest is my understanding -- and I also asked Mr. Rinaldo to correct me if I am wrong as he is listening -- and it is much better for someone who is frailer like Mr. DuPont. He has explained often cardiologists don't recommend doing the more invasive type of bypass surgery for individuals like him because of exactly what he explained, that it can lead to adverse outcomes in the middle of the procedure.

So to your question of can they do can the BOP arrange or provide access to a hospital that is able to do a less invasive form of procedure, I'm not sure. I know that the BOP has been in charge of this care thus far and that has not yet happened. So all I can say is that much, your Honor.

I do want to return to kind of the big picture here and our sort of sentencing argument.

THE COURT: Hold on one second.

MS. BAHARANYI: Yes. Of course.

(pause)

MS. BAHARANYI: So your Honor, the big picture here,

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. . . .

what we are asking for in time-served is the opportunity for Mr. DuPont to live out his remaining years with family. He does not have long to live. Dr. Kush has made that clear. His life expectancy at this point is two years and a guideline range is more than double that time, your Honor. Mr. DuPont is a significantly different person than the one he was in October 2019 and it's not just us asserting or saying this, it is what is reflected in every single medical record we obtained and have provided to the Court, it is what is reflected in Dr. Kush's report, it is what is reflected in Dr. Kirshner's report.

Individuals like Mr. DuPont in their 80s, they're at an older age, when they experience falls, concussions as he did, this type of decline is not uncommon.

THE COURT: Is not what?

MS. BAHARANYI: Uncommon. Uncommon.

So when elderly people fall, it is not uncommon for their health to then decline. Also, now having cardiovascular issues it is not uncommon for someone to develop these worse health outcomes as they age. Mr. DuPont, we are not saying everything started just in October 2019. Absolutely not. He has suffered from kidney issues since he was a young child, was hospitalized for kidney issues since he was a young child. He suffered from diabetes now for 25 years. So it is certainly not the case that, boom, now his health is poor and in all

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. ...

these various ways but it is now certainly the case that after his arrest he has experienced a particularly sharp decline in his health and that part of it is due to things that we could have — he could have never foreseen when he was out in the community in October, March, 2019.

So, these changes in his health -- and he will speak to how he has used that time to reflect -- but I think these changes in his health are significant to the goals of sentencing as well where we are concerned, this Court is concerned in fashioning a sentence to make sure that it fits the offender.

THE COURT: Make sure?

MS. BAHARANYI: That it fits the offender.

THE COURT: Yes. No, no, no. Of course. I understand. Of course.

MS. BAHARANYI: In this case I think a guideline sentence is not proportional given who Mr. DuPont is today. If he had been in a different position, if he was still a slightly healthier version of himself from March 2019, this would be a different request but that is simply not the case. He was never before hospitalized because of heart failure. That is what's happened to him now in the nearly three years that he has been incarcerated in the Southern District.

So I don't think it is hyperbole to say that we are trying to avoid a death in prison sentence. That is exactly

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

what it is based on; the records, based off of what experts who have said who have reviewed his medical record and his state. And, fortunately, we have an alternative. The reason why I pointed out to the Court that his son has been on every call is I think it is important to see the kind of support he will have if he is released. I don't wish prison on anyone -- as the Court is probably not surprised to hear -- but prison has had the kind of positive effect of reconnecting Mr. DuPont with his son, with Mr. Rinaldo. And Mr. Rinaldo is not just a son who loves his father and can just provide generic, vaque support. No. He is prepared to provide a very specific kind of support to his father upon release starting at the point of release. We are in communication -- I am in communication with his Windsor Park -- the Windsor Park staff here. If he were to be sentenced to time-served, they would coordinate with him so he can actually come to New York and take his father back with him to California. He would live with his father -- sorry in reverse, his father would live with him and his two sons, ages 8 and 9 years old, and his wife who is a dental hygienist so also in the medical field although different type of medical field. He would have his own bedroom and he would remain there only until his son is able to put him into the nursing home. And he has explained to me a number of times -- and I have explained to the Court in our submission -- that it does require him being out so that he can set up the nursing home

placement. We have already provided him with the background information that he needs but what he has to be able --

THE COURT: I was a little unclear about that, too, and I don't really know, although I have had elderly parents.

One can't get a placement or a bed or a fix on where one is going to go, for example, in assisted living or nursing home, particularly you have to be out of jail in order to identify a placement? I find that strange.

MS. BAHARANYI: He has identified potential placements but he needs to be out of jail so that his California insurance can cover any of those placements and they can tell him what the prices will be for them to hold his father.

THE COURT: Well, certainly that information is available if one is a resident of California. I mean, you don't have to be in a certain place to be a resident of California and to know what the rate would be in the Windsor Park facility in California, for example, assuming there were one. I have no idea. It just seems to -- it doesn't make sense to me, but yeah.

MS. BAHARANYI: They're not --

THE COURT: Before you continue, let me just ask one thing or two things.

First, I think I may have misspoke. I'm not sure that the obstruction is a consecutive sentence and I will hear from Mr. Rossmiller if that's right or not; but second, how much

1 | time has he already served?

MS. BAHARANYI: He has already been in for 29 months.

THE COURT: 29 months.

MS. BAHARANYI: And he did not plead guilty to obstruction, your Honor; it's an enhancement within the guidelines but it is actually not a separate sentence because he didn't plead guilty to that.

THE COURT: His guideline range is 75 to 87 months; is that correct?

MS. BAHARANYI: That is correct.

THE COURT: That's with the enhancement. Got it. But it is not -- I get it. OK.

MS. BAHARANYI: Factoring in the agg ID charge.

THE COURT: Yes, I got it.

MS. BAHARANYI: We are in the fortunate position that Mr. Rinaldo, his son, is actually most familiar with California nursing homes because of his work, and so he has already begun the process for doing the research and investigation and that's how I now know what is required. I am not an expert in California but fortunately his son very much is. So with his assistance, Mr. DuPont the father is going to be in a position to get placed into a nursing home with his assistance upon his release.

Your Honor, what has now occurred as Mr. DuPont explained to me, a nursing home in California will allow him to

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

be closer to his family so there is a world in which we are trying to ask for him to be placed permanently --

THE COURT: No, I get it.

MS. BAHARANYI: -- with his son. And his son understands he doesn't have the ability to take on the forever long-term care of his father, but he is there to be interim and he does have the connection and the resources to put him into a nursing home near Ventura. And I think that's significant too, your Honor, because Mr. DuPont, with his cardiovascular issues, with his dementia, with Type II diabetes, with kidney failure, with gout, he will be placed in what we call a federal medical center, FMC. So he wouldn't remain at MDC or go to general population at a random facility, there are exactly seven facilities that are considered federal medical centers. The closest one of those to Ventura, California is in Texas, which is several hours away and far difficult for Mr. Rinaldo, his son, to get to in the event of any emergences or something if that were to happen to Mr. DuPont. It certainly does not facilitate his ability to be connected with family, to be able to receive visits from his grandsons or sons if he is incarcerated in Fort Worth, Texas, far from his son and grandsons.

So I think the limited availability of these types of facilities and the availability of truly both, I believe, exceptional medical care and oversight from his son in

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. . . .

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

California is another reason that a time-served sentence is appropriate. Of course, the Court is going to be concerned about deterrence, like what message does this send if I give a time-served sentence to someone like Mr. DuPont and someone who is engaged in fraud and we certainly do not intend to minimize the fraud. It certainly was extensive in its reach but I think there are individuals who see that Mr. DuPont was given a 29-month sentence with his background, with his health issues, in a case that was non-violent and in a case where the individual loss to folks was around \$100 or less. I think if they see there was still a substantial sentence yet not a quideline sentence, they will be deterred from engaging in this same conduct, especially if they're younger, especially if they don't have the laundry list of health issues that Mr. DuPont has. He is truly in a somewhat unique position in terms of his frailty and his age and how those two interact.

THE COURT: I am certainly going to take them into account. That's who he is so I am certainly going to take that into Court.

MS. BAHARANYI: Your Honor, I will wrap up because I believe we have covered and exhausted probably the physical health issues and I do think that is the primary reason why a time-served sentence is warranted or appropriate, but I do want to address this concern about what could he do on computers, what could he do if he were given access to the Internet, that

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

reason raised in the government's submissions prior.

This offense was not something that was committed by himself. I think that part has not been fully explained or supplied to the Court before. He was not a lone actor, he had assistance, and he had assistance from someone who is very well versed in computers and technology so he was not by himself in this. Nevertheless this Court, and other Courts in this district, have routinely put into place restrictions on computer access or Internet access for people who commit computer-based crimes, computer-based crimes like accessing child pornography, distributing child pornography. Probation has ways of monitoring that conduct and can certainly monitor that conduct for someone like Mr. DuPont inside of a nursing home and, in our view, far more easily than for a young person convicted of another computer-based offense in the community. So I don't think that that concern for future potential harm requires more time in custody in prison when there are other less obtrusive -- truly, frankly less harmful alternatives available to the Court.

THE COURT: Yes. So in point of fact, as we discussed before, so if I understand the situation correctly, Mr. DuPont is and has been -- you call it incarceration and it certainly is, he is not free to leave, but he has been at Windsor Park Nursing Home which is exactly, sounds to me, like the kind of facility that he is intending and needing and planning to go to

except that it is not in California. So this, by the way, is the only case I have ever had, I think, where -- and I was actually at the beginning, you may remember, I was a little bit surprised that he was in a nursing home I guess at the government's expense.

But in terms of the care, the treatment, the feeding, the room, the cleaning, he has all of that has had -- just a minute, this is my understanding -- he has all of that as long as he has been in this Windsor Park Nursing Home and he has hardly ever been in a jail. You pointed that out. So, the conditions that have been afforded to him by the government I'm not saying it is a good thing because he can't leave and all of that, I'm not saying it is an ideal place, but it is fairly extraordinary the resources that have been extended to him of both resources in both living accommodation and medical care for that matter.

So, it strikes me that the biggest difference would be that he will get to see his grandchildren, you know, often.

MS. BAHARANYI: Your Honor, I am glad you raised that because that is still absolutely not the case, that the only difference is he gets to see his grandchildren.

THE COURT: I am overstating it but how many clients have you had that, during their incarceration, they have been placed in a nursing home or assisted living or whatever, which is -- maybe I'm being a little too clear about it but which is,

from what I am understanding from what you have told me, that he is looking for an appropriate nursing home and I'm just pointing out -- I'm not saying -- so what I am saying is from what I can see and what I have heard and what I have read, his medical needs have been attended to. It is not like he is parked away in the MDC or the MCC. That would be a whole different story. I think he has hardly been in either of those kinds of facilities and I think it is fair and important to point out that our system, as best it can, has come up with a pretty humane and caring and probably expensive -- I have no ideas -- facility for someone precisely -- someone who is of Mr. DuPont's age and, nevertheless, is a criminal.

MS. BAHARANYI: This has not been --

THE COURT: You are going to say why I am wrong. Let's hear about that.

MS. BAHARANYI: It is something that we have -- I have described in our last submission on page 5, just how the conditions differ. Right? If he were to be placed in a nursing home in California it is not just geography that changes. Every day that Mr. DuPont is in custody and has been in custody while in a hospital, while in a nursing home here he has been shackled to his bed. So what that means is instead of other individuals who are able to ambulate, walk around, get to sort of integrate regular normal exercise into their day to become stronger, to become healthier, he himself has been

shackled by his ankles to another bed frame in another room with other inmates who are also shackled to their beds, sometimes three inmates in one room with four to six guards in that same crowded room. Not only is it a COVID disaster waiting to happen, but it truly shows you that this is not the liberty that other individuals in nursing homes have.

When we met with the Court about two years ago with the marshal service joining the phone call, the marshal supervisor explained that they have to keep people shackled, have to keep guards in the room. Even if they're 80 years old like Mr. DuPont, the shackles are necessary for limitations in their movement. They aren't allowed to go into the courtyard for any fresh air, they stay inside at all times shackled to their bed and he is incarcerated, it is not something we have the ability to change because the marshals say that is a security necessity but that has been his life.

When he is in the bed, when he is shackled to his bed, your Honor, he has no ability to go change the TV or do the things that a normal person in a nursing home would be able to do. So it truly isn't just a matter of he wants to be closer to his family, he has been incarcerated. He has felt he effects of incarceration and it has had a physical effect on his body as well just contributing to the frailty that Dr. Kirschner explained in her report.

One moment, your Honor?

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. ...

. . . .

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

(Defendant and counsel conferring)

MS. BAHARANYI: Your Honor, I think that another point is -- our meeting time to be coming but another thing we want to make sure the Court is aware of is he is not getting high-quality medical care here to the degree he would receive if he were in a placement identified by his son, monitored by his son, close to his family where there is some expense of accountability not just to Mr. DuPont but also family members who are there, present, and love him. Instead, we had to get an ombudsman involved in his case to ensure that he is getting things like proper meals. There are appointments that should have been made for him from this nursing home to go follow up with his cardiovascular care that should have been made months ago. We have been harassing and talking to the nursing home constantly to try to make that happen. But this is -- I hate to say it, but I think this is the consequence of someone being in custody in this place, right, instead of someone being at liberty and at a nursing home that they and their families have been able to choose that provides a level of quality of care.

THE COURT: Yes. Don't get me wrong. I am not suggesting that I don't realize there is a difference between being in custody and being at liberty. There is no question. I appreciate that and you are pointing out the differences, yes. I certainly not only appreciate it but I understand it.

MS. BAHARANYI: I think there is something critical in

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. . . .

. . .

being able to choose a place that is going to be able to meet his needs and that's focused on meeting medical needs. Right? He is in a position where he has a number of them, a laundry list of medical needs, and his son is in a position where he knows the best places possible in California to make sure that he is getting the treatment that he does in fact need. Bureau of Prisons is an agency that is about detention and punishment and holding people. They're not a medical agency, that's not their first priority. They will endeavor to try to provide service to individuals but because it is not their first priority, they fail often. And I don't want to see that sort of failure for Mr. DuPont, who is already in such a precarious physical position, frail position, and old, elderly.

So, your Honor, for these reasons, I know this is a tough case, I know this is a difficult case in many ways because it is uncommon. There are facts here I have never encountered. I have never had such an elderly client. I actually haven't had a client in Windsor Park Nursing Home although our office has had others who have been incarcerated there. But I do think that his needs now as an individual do require or do warrant placement at home with his family.

THE COURT: I got it.

MS. BAHARANYI: Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. DuPont, you will have to move the camera or tilt it. That's better.

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. . . .

• • • •

THE DEFENDANT: Thank you, your Honor, for allowing me this time to express my deep remorse for the crimes I have committed.

As the Court is aware, I have numerous chronic health conditions such as kidney failure, which I have had since I was 9 years old; diabetes, which I have had for the last 25 years; but the one that gives me the deep pause for reflection is my heart disease. I believe you are aware I have had three heart attacks in the last six months including one where my heart actually stopped. Many have noted, when faced with your imminent death, your mind really focuses on your past; for me, such as the criminal activities which I have pled guilty.

It is hard to express the deep remorse I have for this conduct. I realize that these crimes were based on the sins of greed and pride. I pray every day, off and on, for hours. I pray that God and the Court will accept my sincere remorse. Fortunately, during my prayers, a calmness flooded my person, assuring me God has heard and accepted my humble prayers and shown mercy.

My doctors tell me that my left descending cardiac artery is 95 percent blocked. I could die any minute. Here in the nursing home, when I left the hospital, the doctor said you have to return in about 10 days because we want to try to unblock your left artery. I have told the nursing home repeatedly I have got to go back to the hospital and they

ignore my request. It is 90 days when the hospital wanted me back in 10 days.

The reason why I want to go back to California is because I know I'm going to die and I want to die with my family around me, I don't want to die alone.

Thank you, your Honor. I am hoping you have mercy on me.

THE COURT: Mr. Rossmiller?

MR. ROSSMILLER: Would you like to hear from the government, your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes. If you wish to be heard.

MR. ROSSMILLER: Yes, I do. Your Honor, I will be, I think, very brief.

First of all -- well, first of all, on a small point, I think Ms. Baharanyi noted in response to the Court's questions but I just want to confirm, the obstructive conduct is taken into account in the guidelines calculation so that's not a separate or consecutive sentence. I expect to ask the Court to dismiss that underlying charge at the conclusion of today's sentencing proceeding so it is relevant conduct but not a separate charge.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. ROSSMILLER: Looking to the broader picture, the government does not dispute that Mr. DuPont has serious health issues that is totally appropriate for the Court to consider.

The Court can and should, and I am sure will take that into account in its decision making, and the government has no quarrel with those arguments in terms of Mr. DuPont's current situation. The Court is, I think, understandably asked about the difference between the situation now versus when he was committing the offenses including the bail jumping, but just for the purposes of right now, the government again acknowledges that there are serious health issues and that those are a factor.

The government, nevertheless, does believe that a guideline sentence would be appropriate even taking into account those factors. The government is not seeking an above guidelines calculation despite the fact that Mr. DuPont has committed five felony offenses throughout his life over the course of decades. We are not seeking an above guideline sentence despite a lengthy flight from bail so we think the guidelines calculation is appropriate here.

I am going to, your Honor, largely rest on our submission, unless the Court has specific questions, other than to say it is concerning for the government, and we submit should be concerning for the Court, that Mr. DuPont remains willing to not tell the truth to the Court about some of these matters. I will note, as we said in our submission, that Mr. DuPont says that some of the donated funds did in fact support the political candidates and campaigns by financing

callbacks on behalf of the candidates. That's false. That is just not true. There is no evidence of that. The government put in its submission four months ago, there has been no evidence in response to that since is the defense argued that he didn't deprive causes and candidates of "the full economic support of the donations he received" or the full benefit of those solicited donations. Again, it was the entirety of all of the donations that went to Mr. DuPont, certainly none went to the candidates or causes and the claim that the candidates were supported through the websites that provided candidate and election information is also false. The websites were rudimentary, they included limited boiler plate information to the extent they included quotes from the candidates, all of those quotes were invented, none of them were true.

In terms of his explanation submitted for the first time today about bail jumping, your Honor, I don't think that explanation passes the smell test. The U-Haul was rented to --

THE COURT: It was hard to follow and a little bit hard to grasp how that unfolded.

MR. ROSSMILLER: Your Honor, I think I would say that it is hard to credit. The U-Haul was rented to be returned in Washington. There is no allegation that Mr. DuPont went there. In fact, the allegation from the government is the opposite, that he entered into a contract to return it in Washington State. He didn't go anywhere near there. When he — there has

been no submission to the Court of a receipt for a purported round trip flight. There is certainly no suggestion that when he found out that he had missed a flight, supposedly, that he tried to get on another flight. I don't want to belabor that point, I think the Court has a firm grasp of the issues there, and I am not looking for further disputes about it but I note that there are — there is no particular evidence in the record to back that up.

So given the fact that Mr. DuPont has done this or something like this five times, given the fact that it affected thousands of people over the course of years, given the fact that Mr. DuPont appears to have, by all of the evidence, engineered this scheme and given the fact that he has expressed no remorse whatsoever, the government thinks that a guideline sentence is appropriate.

THE COURT: So just a couple of procedural matters.

First, defense counsel and/or the government -
defense counsel, really -- is there anything that is of a

factual nature that you would like to put in evidence or prove

or have a hearing with respect to -- I don't want to preclude

you or prevent you, or is it OK to go forward on the record

that is before us?

MS. BAHARANYI: We are not seeking to have any sort of factual hearing, your Honor. I do think you have actually heard Mr. DuPont express his remorse and express also that he

should have made it to New York when he didn't, so I take -- I bristle a bit at that statement by the government that there has been no expression of remorse, that he has denied or lied about the bail jumping. He knows he should have returned and he did not and that's why we pled guilty with that guideline enhancement included because he did the conduct.

THE COURT: Right. I get it.

MS. BAHARANYI: So beyond that, your Honor, I think the record is clear, especially with respect to the physical health issues which are our primary reason for seeking the below guideline sentence that we are asking for.

MR. ROSSMILLER: Your Honor, if I may just respond very, very briefly? I have great respect for Ms. Baharanyi and I should clarify. I didn't mean to suggest that Mr. DuPont has not expressed a lack of remorse for the bail jumping — which I think he has. What we have seen a lack of remorse with respect to is the underlying offense here of stealing hundreds of thousands of dollars from thousands of donors.

THE COURT: OK.

MS. BAHARANYI: When he expressed his deep remorse, your Honor, that was for this conduct.

THE COURT: For the underlying fraud.

MS. BAHARANYI: Precisely. Precisely.

THE COURT: No, I get it.

MS. BAHARANYI: His greed and his pride were his exact

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. . . .

words, your Honor. 1 2 THE COURT: I get it. 3 Let's see. So I'm going to adopt the findings of fact in the presentence report unless -- I think we went over this 4 5 before but I will try it one more time. 6 Does defense counsel have any further objections to 7 the presentence report? 8 MS. BAHARANYI: Your Honor, no further objections. 9 THE COURT: And none from Mr. DuPont either? 10 THE DEFENDANT: No. 11 THE COURT: Or Mr. Rossmiller? 12 MR. ROSSMILLER: No, your Honor. Thank you. 13 THE COURT: So at this point in time I would like to 14 just take a five-minute break, or if you need more time 10 15 minutes, while I collect some thoughts in my head. And so, it is now, I have New York time 12:08, we say 12:18, so it will be 16 17 10 minutes and then I will finish up the sentence. 18 Is that OK with you all? 19 MS. BAHARANYI: That's OK for the defense. Thank you. 20 MR. ROSSMILLER: Yes, your Honor. The government will 21 be here so whenever the Court returns. 22 THE COURT: Fair enough. OK. 23 I am just going to put myself on mute. 24 (recess)

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. ...

THE COURT: So I will first state the sentence that I

\_

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

intend to impose and then I will impose it.

I have been persuaded to give a lesser sentence than I was intending to give, largely, of course, based on issues of health but I am not -- I could not, in good conscience, get to a time-served sentence. I am going to impose a sentence of 42 months of incarceration, which is dramatically lower than the low end of the guideline range -- the guideline range is 75 to 87 months based on an offense level of 23 and a Criminal History Category of II -- that's going to be followed by supervised release for three years, subject to the following mandatory conditions: that Mr. DuPont not commit another federal, state, or local crime; two, that he not illegally possess a controlled substance; three, that he refrain from any unlawful use of a controlled substance; be required to submit to one drug test within 15 days of placement on supervised release and at least two unscheduled drug tests thereafter. addition, he is required to comply with the standard conditions 1 through 12 which are found on pages 29 through 31 of the presentence investigation report and they include, among other things, that he must not own, possess, or have access to a firearm, etc. The list of 12 is readily available to you and is in the presentence report.

And then these following special conditions which the Court finds are reasonably related to the factors set forth in Section 3553(a)(1), (a)(2)(B), (a)(2)(C) and (a)(2)(D) which

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. . . .

the Court also finds involve no greater deprivation of liberty than is reasonably necessary for the purposes set forth in Section 3553(a)(2)(B), (a)(2)(C), (a)(2)(D), and are consistent with policy statements issued by the Sentencing Commission pursuant to 28, U.S.C., Section 944(a). These special conditions include that defendant may only reside, upon release from incarceration, with his son at his son's home, or directly at a nursing home that they have selected. Those are the only two places where he may reside directly from release from incarceration.

He will be supervised in his district of residence. He is required to report to probation within 24 hours of release from incarceration from custody. He is required to participate in weekly therapeutic counseling by a licensed therapist. And he is also required — this is throughout the term of supervised release — to attend and participate in weekly group therapeutic counseling headed by a licensed therapist as well.

The emphasis, just so you know on mental health, is largely in my mind, based upon his life-long criminal conduct and activity and evasion. And I found — and find very disturbing that however we — it is the bail jumping or the obstruction of justice, that kind of behavior continuing right up to the very end. So I think there is a need for individual therapy and also for group therapy, each on a weekly basis, for

entire term of supervised release.

And, he may be required to contribute to the costs of services rendered as by co-payment in an amount to be determined by the probation officer based on such factors as ability to pay or availability of third-party payment.

And, he is also required to provide the probation officer with access to any requested financial information they may seek.

And, he must not incur any new credit card charges or open any additional lines of credit without -- are you in the process, Mr. DuPont? I don't want to disturb.

MS. BAHARANYI: I'm sorry, your Honor. We are --

THE COURT: If you need time to talk, why don't we take a break, but it is very disconcerting to have the defendant not listening to the sentence that's being imposed.

MS. BAHARANYI: I think he hears, your Honor. We are engaged. Thank you.

THE COURT: I was saying that one of the special conditions is also that he must not incur new credit card charges or open any additional lines of credit without the approval of the probation officer unless he has completed any financial obligations that arise as a result of this sentence.

I am not imposing a fine, I don't intend to, none is recommended by the Probation Department.

I am intending to impose restitution in the amount of

\$245,000. It is payable to the Clerk of Court, Southern District of New York, at 500 Pearl Street, and this is for the benefit of the victims in Count One, the names of victims and specific amounts owed were provided by the government I think in three spreadsheets and will be forwarded to the clerk's office.

During the term of imprisonment if he were to be engaged -- it doesn't seem like this is likely, but he doesn't seem to -- it doesn't seem likely that he would be engaged in any employment. If he were engaged in employment as a BOP non-UNICOR work program he would be required to pay \$25 per quarter for the criminal financial penalties. If he were to participate in the BOP'S UNICOR program as a Grade 1 through 4, he would be required to pay 50 percent of his monthly UNICOR earnings toward the criminal financial penalties. And if any portion of the financial penalties, which includes the \$245,000 restitution is unpaid following release from prison, which of course is likely to be the case, then he would be required to pay the balance until paid in installments of 20 percent of any gross monthly revenues.

I have considered the factors set forth at 18, United States Code, Section 3663(a)(1)(B)(i) or 18, U.S. Code Section 3664 in imposing this restitution requirement. And, in any event, I believe it is agreed to by the parties.

There is a special assessment of \$200 which is

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. . . .

mandatory under 18, United States Code, Section 3013.

Briefly, the reasons for this sentence. The offense level is 23, the Criminal History is II, and the guideline range — hold on, I am looking for not the guideline range but I know that — I am looking for a fact sheet that I had.

Anyway, the guideline range, as we said, is 75 to 87 months based on Criminal History Category II, offense level 23. This sentence is, as you can see, is very much lower than the low end of the guideline range, 42 months, compared to the low end of the guideline range which is 75 months. That is a very substantial variance and it is done almost entirely based on Mr. DuPont's physical ailments, his health, and his age.

I believe this sentence is appropriate given the seriousness of the offense and the needs for punishment and deterrence. I have considered the nature and the circumstances of the crime and including the enhancement and the history and characteristics of Mr. DuPont which is, it seems, nearly life-long criminal behavior. It is something that I have rarely encountered in all my years as a Judge and it's a little stunning to me that in fact someone would continue criminal behavior right up until the later portions of life. It is a surprise to me and it causes me great sorrow to encounter with somebody of that nature.

I have also considered the seriousness, as I say, of the crime. I think it is important to promote respect for the

law, to provide a just punishment, to afford adequate deterrence to any further criminal conduct — although I am not sure I am capable of doing that in this instance — to protect the public certainly from further crimes of Mr. DuPont. That is the key to this sentence — one of them — and to provide Mr. DuPont with needed — particularly medical care which he has been receiving up until now, and other correctional treatment in the most effective manner.

So, I am happy to hear from defense counsel and Mr. DuPont and Mr. Rossmiller again before I impose the sentence.

 ${\tt MS.}$  BAHARANYI: Your Honor, if may have one moment?

THE COURT: Sure.

(Defendant and counsel conferring)

THE DEPUTY CLERK: Judge Berman? This is Christine.

THE COURT: Yes.

THE DEPUTY CLERK: While defense counsel is conferring, when defense counsel returns, could you please clarify for the record if the sentence that you intend to impose contains 18 months on the one count followed by 24 months consecutive for the aggregated identity theft count?

THE COURT: Yes.

THE DEPUTY CLERK: Thank you, Judge.

(Defendant and counsel conferring)

MS. BAHARANYI: Your Honor, I wanted to clarify one

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. ...

• • • •

point stated by the Court. In terms of his reporting upon his release, typically it is 72 hours but I was not sure if that's what the Court stated.

THE COURT: No. 24 is what I --

MS. BAHARANYI: 24.

THE COURT: Yes.

MS. BAHARANYI: And that is to the probation office upon his release.

THE COURT: It says also, and I hope you all heard, that when he leaves incarceration, he will be living at only one of two places immediately; first is, or in either order, his son's house or in a nursing home in California.

MS. BAHARANYI: That part we did receive, your Honor. We were just clarifying the timing. Nothing further from the defense.

THE COURT: OK. So, Ms. Murray pointed out that I neglected to assign terms of incarceration to each count. It is 24 on the underlying fraud and 24 months on the underlying fraud and 18 on the enhancement.

MR. ROSSMILLER: Your Honor, this is Alex Rossmiller.

I think you mean the reverse, 18 months on the underlying fraud and 24 on the mandatory fraud; is that right?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. ROSSMILLER: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Yes.

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. ...

1 So 18, right, on the underlying fraud, and 24 on the 2 enhancement. 3 THE DEPUTY CLERK: Judge, that's on the aggravated 4 identity theft count, correct? 5 THE COURT: Yes. 6 THE DEPUTY CLERK: Thank you. 7 So, did you want to add anything else, defense 8 counsel? 9 MS. BAHARANYI: Nothing further, your Honor. 10 THE COURT: Mr. DuPont, anything further? I couldn't 11 hear. 12 THE DEFENDANT: No. Thank you, your Honor. 13 THE COURT: Mr. Rossmiller, anything from you? MR. ROSSMILLER: Your Honor, just a couple quick 14 15 things. I heard the Court describe that it intended to enter 16 17 the restitution order, it imposed a special assessment. I 18 apologize if I missed it while I was taking notes. Did the 19 Court describe an intend to enter, as a final order of 20 forfeiture, the previous consent order of forfeiture that was 21 submitted? 22 THE COURT: Yes. I don't have it in front of me, I 23 don't believe. 24 MR. ROSSMILLER: That's fine, your Honor.

filed on the docket, I don't think it needs to be done right

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

now but I think there will be no objection from the defense to the Court entering that as a final order.

THE COURT: And the amount contained in the forfeiture order was what?

MR. ROSSMILLER: Just a moment, your Honor. Your Honor, the PSR -- I'm sorry.

THE COURT: Go ahead, I am still looking for a fact sheet that I had. Go ahead.

MR. ROSSMILLER: I'm sorry, your Honor. I am looking, I have it right here.

THE COURT: I think --

MR. ROSSMILLER: It is \$245,000; yes, your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: Just one second.

(pause)

MR. ROSSMILLER: I should say, your Honor, just for the reference, that preliminary order of forfeiture was previously filed at Docket no. 53.

THE COURT: In the amount of, again?

MR. ROSSMILLER: \$245,000.

Your Honor, I think after the Court imposes its sentence, as the very final government submission today we will ask the Court to dismiss underlying count but I will wait for the moment to do that.

THE COURT: Hold on one sec. Thanks. (Pause) I will

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. ...

now pronounce sentence.

The guideline range is 51 to 63 months on Count One, and followed by 24 months' consecutive on Count Two, which is the identity theft, and so I am imposing a sentence of 42 months which would be 18 months to Count One and 24 months to Count Two, totaling 42 months together. That is to be followed by three years of supervised release, subject to the mandatory, special, and standard conditions that I mentioned before and incorporate that conversation and discussion here by reference. There is no fine. Restitution has been stated how it is to be paid and forfeiture, as well, in the amount of \$245,000 each, forfeiture — that's the forfeiture amount, and the restitution amount, and the manner in which those are to be paid, same as the discussion that we have had earlier and I incorporate that discussion by reference as well; a \$200 special assessment, \$100 for each count.

The reasons for this sentence are as I have stated earlier and I incorporate that discussion here entirely by reference.

As I said before, I find the case for a sentence within the guideline range to be compelling in many respects but I am persuaded that because of Mr. DuPont's age and medical conditions to make this substantial variance to 42 months which is way below the low end of the guideline range.

Does either counsel know of any legal reason why this

sentence should not be imposed as so stated? Starting with the defense.

MS. BAHARANYI: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Rossmiller?

MR. ROSSMILLER: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Then I hereby order the sentence to be imposed, as so stated.

Mr. DuPont, to the extent that you have not already waived your appeal rights -- and now I am talking about the plea agreement dated June 17, 2021, in which there are included -- can we move Mr. DuPont back into the picture -- there are included waivers of appeal on your part and in fact in that plea agreement you agree that you will not file a direct appeal, nor will you bring a collateral challenge including but not limited to an application under Title 28, United States Code, Sections 2255 and/or 2241 of any sentence that is within or below the guideline range of 75 to 87 months. This sentence that I have imposed is substantially lower than that range so your waivers of appeal do apply certainly in this case.

You also agreed in the plea agreement not to appeal any restitution amount that is equal to or less than \$245,000 and the restitution that I have imposed in this case is \$245,000, so that waiver of appeal also applies.

And, you also agreed in the plea agreement that you

would not appeal the forfeiture amount if it were \$245,000 or less. This forfeiture amount in your case is \$245,000, and so that waiver of appeal also apples.

But to the extent that there is some other right out there that I am not aware of, I notify you of your right to appeal, such a right, and if you are unable to pay the costs of an appeal, you would have the right to apply for leave to appeal in forma pauperis. And if you request, the Clerk of Court would prepare and file a notice of appeal on your behalf immediately.

Do you, Mr. DuPont, understand your waivers of appeal?

I can't hear you.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: OK.

So I think then that concludes our work for today.

Mr. Rossmiller, you indicated there might be open counts. I forget if we resolved them at that point but if you want to make that application right now again, I will make the record clear.

MR. ROSSMILLER: Yes. Thank you, your Honor. The government does move to dismiss any underlying counts in this case including the single count included in indictment no. 19 CR 791 which has been consolidated with this case.

THE COURT: I will grant that application.

And then, starting with the government, did you wish

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. ...

```
M4E5dupS
      to add anything to today's sentencing proceeding?
1
2
               MR. ROSSMILLER: No, your Honor. Thank you.
 3
               THE COURT: How about defense counsel?
               MS. BAHARANYI: No, your Honor. Thank you.
 4
5
               THE COURT: OK. I think that concludes our work for
6
      today.
 7
               Mr. DuPont, I wish you the very best of luck going
8
      forward.
9
               Thanks very much, folks. We are adjourned.
10
                                    000
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. ...